

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a telephone interview on April 11, 2003. During the interview Applicant's representative identified distinguishing features between the invention and the Williams reference (U.S. 6,038,426). The Examiner indicated he would further consider these arguments but did not agree that the case was in condition for allowance.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have addressed the issue relative to the Examiner's objection to the drawings by removing the term "nonremovable" from claim 1, thus eliminating any purported need to amend the drawings. For this reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have addressed the issue relative to the Examiner's objection to the specification by removing the term "nonremovable" from claim 1, thus eliminating any purported need to amend the

specification. For this reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have addressed the issue relative to the Examiner's objection by removing the term "nonremovable" from claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 112 objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castleman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,570,002) in view of an article by Marsha Walton dated January 23, 2001, in view of Francis (U.S. Pat. No. 6,315,618), and further in view of Thompson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,206,480). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The references cited by the Examiner fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least two reasons. First, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings. Second, the references as cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

The Examiner relies on Castleman as disclosing a power port 129j disposed in a housing and a first networking port 126j disposed in the housing. The purported first networking port 126j, however, is not a networking port. In fact, the word "network"

does not appear anywhere in the Castleman reference. Castleman does disclose a system that provides electricity to operate any of a multiplicity of devices. This system also accepts electronic device identification information for any particular one of such devices (see Abstract). There is simply no statement or suggestion anywhere in Castleman of the universal power-supply connection of Castleman further comprising a network connection. To further clarify this distinction, claim 8 has been amended to indicate that the network is an intranet. Therefore, none of the references either individual or in combination contain all of the limitations of claim 8.

Next, the Examiner does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since there is no objective reason to combine the teachings of each of the references including Castleman, Walton, Francis, and Thompson. Specifically, Castleman makes no reference of a network, Walton does not establish how a device such as a laptop computer is connected to a network, and specifically makes no reference to a networking connection disposed on a seat of a mobile platform. Similarly, neither Francis nor Thompson disclose a networking connection disposed on a seat of a mobile platform. There is no suggestion in any of these references to combine their teachings resulting in a "connector module disposed on a seat of a mobile platform" comprising a power port and two different networking ports." In addition, since the level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references there is no *prima facie* basis for a 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 8-10 (see MPEP 2143.01). Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/4/03

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk Reg. No. 33686
Dean W. Amburn, Reg. No. 46517